Vol 1, #6 Dec 68

REASON on current events. Published monthly except in June, July, and August by the staff at 42 Euston Rd. Brighton, Mass. 02135

editor-publisher.....Lanny Friedlander
distribution-production.....David Narlee
subscription services.....Peter Neilson

The editor of REASON is in agreement with the philosophy of Objectivism; however, REASON is not an organ of Objectivism. Except where explicitly stated otherwise, the responsibility for the contents belongs to the editor.

Writers: Send for a free list of recommended topics. Return postage must accompany all manuscripts.

GEORGE WALLACE AND THE NEW LEFT: A STUDY IN MIRROR IMAGES

The new-leftist hecklers at George Wallace's speeches, the furious fights that break out between Wallace's supporters and detractors, and the often vicious denunciations slung back and forth in the news, have persuaded many that there must be some fundamental conflict-in-philosophy between the Alabama American Independent and the worshippers of Che Guevara. The conviction that Wallace is the Right, and SDS the Left, and that never the twain shall meet, has been nourished by the press, which has taken violent disagreement between the two groups on specific issues as a sign of a deep rift all around.

The schema is deceptively simple, and eminently tailored to certain political uses. Wallace is the far right, Nixon moderate right, Humphrey moderate left, and the Faceless Horde far left. Beautiful. Nixon, accordingly, is really a moderate Wallace-ite. ("We wouldn't want to say that Richard Nixon is a racist or anything, God knows, he isn't, but...but...he appeals to that Wallace element, doesn't he?) And the Faceless Horde really isn't so bad, since it's just bringing out the "hypocrisy of liberals." One of the ways in which it accomplishes this noble purpose, it is said, is through its ringing opposition to George Wallace and the Right.

The contemporary American press, supposed enemy of superstition and naivete, has let itself be led down the idyllic Wallace-to-New-Left path like lambs to the proverbial slaughter. When confronted with the abundant evidence of basic similarities -- of philosophical cohibitation -- of the two "extremes," the press becomes an oddly Puritan witness, which will neither see, hear, nor report the liaison to the innocent.

To visualize the common bond of the Wallace movement and the New Left, one might imagine two murderous Underworld figures facing each other in a lethal showdown. Although they may be in desperate dispute over some specific issue (such as who gets the loot, and who controls the gang), they agree on violence as the standard method of settling disagreements.

Despite the sloppy attempts of the press to project Wallace as a "rightist" (REVOLT OF THE RIGHT: WALLACE AND LEMAY, October 18, cover of Time), the label will not stick. That Wallace is no rightist (one who avocates capitalism and freedom), can easily be documented. As he himself has said, "I'm not against spending (other people's) money -- I'm not against spending for roads and bridges, harbors and docks, hospitals and schools." "...At heart," said Representative John M Ashbrook (R Ohio), recently, "(Wallace) is a populist with strong tendencies in the direction of the collectivist welfare state."

What apparently confuses the press and much of his own following is Wallace's repeated equation of freedom with "local control." For instance, a little old lady who attended his Boston campaign speech is reported to have said that she supported his because of his stand on "states' rights...the principle the Founding Fathers built this country on."

But, as Wallace has demonstrated in Alabama, "states' rights" are not the same as individual rights. Alabama's blatent infringments of rights -- such as segregation in public schools and hospitals, six percent sales tax, and unusually extensive applications of "eminent domain" -- make clear that Wallace conceives of federal power not primarily as a threat to the security of individual citizens, but as a challenge to his regional hegemony.

The affiny between this "rightist" and the New Left is apparent in the appeal of both to racism, "local control," anti-intellectualism, the common man, and brute force. Wallace's racism runs rampant through his past speeches ("Segregation today -- Segregation tomorrow -- and Segregation forever" --inaugural address, January 14, 1963) -- and past actions (his "stand in the schoolhouse door" at the University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa in 1963 to prevent the admission of two Negroes.) It also permeates the position of the New Left, as exemplified in its active support of "blacks only" dormitories (Northwestern University), "pro-black" prejudice in admissions policies, "black history" courses, seminars in tribal African culture, and its support of "black power" and "black pride" in general.

Wallace's pleas for "local control" mirror with startling precision the New Left's drive for "decentralization." Both seem directed against the Establishment -- and both seek, not to destroy it, but to fragment it, to parcel out its power to local school boards or local workers' committees. A hill may be smaller than a mountain, but it's easier to climb; better king of the hill, than king of nothing at all.

With respect to anti-intellectualism, if it were not for the accents it would be difficult to tell the American Independents and the New Leftists apart. "I'm not," says Wallace, "like all those pseudo-liberals who think that their mind is the greatest thing on earth." "Action now, talk later," echoes the New Left, thoughtfully.

The synchronism between Wallace's appeal to the "common man," and the New Left's solicitation of "working class" support hardly

requires elaboration. Both are paeans to society's pharisaic indolent-of-spirit.

Both Wallace and the New Left offer, as the answer to every social problem, the indiscriminate use of brute force. Are you disturbed by looting and rioting? Mow down a few unarmed looters; that'll solve the problem. Are you "uptight" about the Masters of War? Storm the headquarters of the local university; that'll solve that problem. In their mutual dream-world, all the "anarchists" that Wallace failed to run down in his automobile, would be out seizing the nearest available property. Both groups could vent their passions, build their armies and destroy each other, without the obstructions of civilization. Perhaps it is this vision which accounts for the gudgingly approving look and tone of the new leftist who says, "Well, Wallace may be a bastard, but he's better than those others. At least he doesn't fool around!"

Political commentators often use Wallace's nationalism and the Left's internationalism as evidence of their political antagonism. But instead of proving their antagonism, Wallace's flag-waving and the New Left's flag-burning suggest deep ideological brotherhood.

Wallace's patriotism represents a blind ("America, right or wrong") collectivist concept of the nation, just as the New Left's love of collectivist doctrine drives it to support the most totalitarian nations on earth. In this as in almost every other instance of apparent hostility between Wallace and the New Left, close examination reveals amazing affinity instead. Like the pistons in an internal combusion engine which, although they fire at different times and move at different angles, meet at the crankshaft to drive a car, Wallace and the New Left would, despite their surface differences, head us towards a single political dead-end: dictatorship.

Note: I would like to thank William Van Doren, editor of the Diode at Johns Hopkins University, for extensive assistance in writing this article. However, I am solely responsible for its content. Our regular readers will remember our September recommendation of Mr. Van Doren's publication. They will recall that we said of the Diode: "(It) analyzes current events and campus issues with consistently good logic and clarity, relating the issues to the underlying principles and premises in an exceptionally intelligent and perceptive manner." The three issues published since that recommendation have not altered our opinion. Of particular significence, is Mr. Van Doren's analysis of a recent political event in Boston, last month's Young Americans for Freedom take-over of the Resistance (a New Left organization) office, which appeared under "news-and-comment" in the Diode's November issue. He calls forth some rather harrowing historical parallels from the era of the Weimar Republic to round out an extremely well-argued condemnation of the YAF trepass. Samples of that issue are available for 25¢ each. A one year subscription of 10 issues is $2. The Diode, Box 2130, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 21218

L.F.

"No where else in the world..."

A South Boston mother of six is found dead in her apartment. The cause of death is determined to be internal laceration, the result of an attempt at self-abortion.

In a northern suburb of Boston, a woman college student drops out of school and cancels a promising musical career to bear an undesired child.

A Roxbury doctor is arrested and, like a common criminal, thrown into jail for performing a safe, simple, short, and possibly life-saving operation upon a patient too poor to travel out of state.

An infant, beaten to death, is found abandoned on the steps of the state capitol building.

These are some of its less fortunate victims, Massachusetts birth control laws. Passed in 1897, modified in 1966, Mass. General Law, chapter 272, sections 20 and 21 ("crimes against chastity, morality, decency, and good order"), prohibits the sale, distribution, or dissemination of birth control items or information to unmarried persons. Those convicted under this stature face up to 5 years imprisonment and $1000 fine for each violation.

The object of the law, explained Assistant District Attorney Joeseph R Nolan, in the Boston Globe of Dec. 3rd, 1968, "certainly is morality and morals." Other officials say that its supposed to dampen promiscuity.

But even a brief study of the wording of the laws would show that, to the extent promiscuous love-making is thwarted, so too are serious affairs. The actual design of the law, then, is an attack on premarital sex, on the faulty assumption that sex before marraige is, by its nature, immoral. Setting aside the issue of whether or not premarital sex is moral, does the State have the right to dictate morality to its citizens? No. The proper function of government is the use of retalatory force to protect its citizens fron initiated force or fraud; voluntary use of birth control items by individuals or consenting couples cannot be considered the proper concern of the State. The idea that the government can dictate to what peaceful purpose an individual must or must not put his body is a total negation of the proper role of government.

Even if birth control could be shown an evil, laws prohibiting the sale of contraceptives would still be wrong. A moral government must punish, not prevent, criminal acts; in order to prevent crimes it would be necessary, to some degree, to initiate force against innocent citizens, an operation no moral government may rightfully perform.

William Baird, the man who successfullychallenged the birth control laws of New York and New Jersey, recently said of Massachusetts' laws: "Nowhere else in the world can a person lose up to ten years of his

life for a lecture on birth control with a contraceptive tube in his hand."

With the exception, perhaps, of Soviet Russia.

The ten years Mr. Baird speaks of are his own. On April 7, 1967, he was arrested for the display and distribution of contraceptive material at a student assembly at Boston University. Convicted on October 17, 1967, he is presently free on bond, awaiting the final decision (expected in January) of an appeal directed at the Mass. Supreme court on December 2nd, 1968.

While Mr. Baird's crusade against the laws is admirable, his arguments are not. He has an unnerving habit of expending an enormous amount of energy convincing his audences of the dire concequences of over-population rather than concentrating upon the pivot issue: rights. To this issue, which will decide where he spends the ten years, he seems incapable of properly applying himself. In fact, he appears intent on chopping away whatever protection it might have afforded him. At his trial, he allowed his lawyer to argue that birth control freedom is a"constitutional" right rather than an "economic" one. The implication of that claim is truly terrifying. Legally, there is no such dichotomy as "constitutional" rights versis "economic" rights. The two are not divisible; "constitutional" rights (such as the right of free speech) hinge upon "economic" rights (such as the right to own property). For example, how could an individual exercise his right to free speech, unless he has some property to speak <u>from</u>, and the right (or privilege, if the property belongs to a second party) to <u>use</u> it for the purpose of speaking?

Speaking of the Pope's statements on birth control during a Boston Globe interview, Mr. Baird asked, "How dare the Pope tell world government leaders not to set aside funds for birth control?"

From this, it is a fair inference that Mr. Baird favors government distribution of contraceptives. Assumedly, these would be passed out to those too poor to purchase them on the open market. Who would be forced to pay for all this? We don't believe Mr. Baird has taken this question into consideration. Does he propose to increase the tax on the family of six whose income is above the arbitrary government-set "poverty" line? Or does he propose to more heavily tax the corporations, whose giant capital accumulations made the research, production, and distribution of the contraceptives possible in the first place. Either way, everyone loses. The "argument from need" is, indeed, no argument at all.

But in addition to these considerations, there is a probable long range effect of government-sponsored birth control. Even those with only a passing knowlege of American politics are aware that government "help" has a strong tendency to become government meddling, and to finally proceed to government <u>control</u>. How long would it be before the government would be under pressure to require couples to submit applications in order to have children?

Let's not find out. Those who would support drives to abolish birth

control laws, but at the same time, are consistent enough to see the fallacy of government distribution of contraceptives, should make clear the basis of their support. They should make clear that they are arguing from the world of rights, not the wasteland of need. Otherwise, they may someday find they have to ask permission to have a left-handed kid.

Towards the purpose of producing a larger, better researched, and better-written magazine, beginning January 1st, 1969, REASON will raise its subscription rate (and single copy price) from 8 issues for $1 to 9 issues for $2 (from 10¢ to 25¢). Money received after this date will be prorated. This change does not in any way effect current subscribers. Note: gift subscriptions will be $1.75. Boston University subscriptions will be $1. Back issues are available from NO 3 on: 25¢ each. 10 or more copies of any up-coming issue will be 10¢ each plus postage. No bulk rates on back issues.

COMPLIMENTARY COPIES: Send us the names and addresses of friends whom you think would subscribe to REASON, and we will be happy to send t them copies, free of charge.All names kept strictly confidential.
OR
Send for as many as 25 free copies (more under special conditions) of any up-coming issue. 30 days prior notice required. Include a brief explanitory letter.

"We all want to change the world, but when you talk about destruction ..."
We have heard from or about student groups which are in intellectual opposition to the New Left (see editor's note in NO 5) in over a dozen major cities, including Boston, New York, Washington, D.C., Charlottesville, Atlanta, Lansing (Mich.), Chicago, Detroit, Houston, Austin, Pasadena, Baltimore, Grove City, and Madison. However, even in the cities listed above, our information is still terribly scanty. Please help make this survey complete. Our Webster's, which lists thousands of colleges, puts us to shame. Any information will be most appreciated, and the donor will receive a free copy of issue in which the results appear.Please help.

Next Month: A plan to save the cities. A REAL plan to save the cities. We call it capitalism, and we discuss it next month. In REASON.